



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,494	07/21/2003	Kenji Matsuhara	018775-874	5002
7590 04/21/2008 BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER QIN, YIXING	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,494

Applicant(s)

MATSUHARA ET AL.

Examiner

Yixing Qin

Art Unit

2625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-13, 15 and 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 14, 16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-6, 14, 16 and 18 in the reply filed on 3/4/08 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

I. Claims 1-5, 14, 16 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,048)

Regarding claims 1, 14, 16, Tanaka discloses an image processing apparatus equipped with a plurality of processings for image data, comprising:

a communication device which receives and transmits image data and a command through a network; (Fig. 1, item 101 is a network interface. Fig. 2 shows data and various commands to be transferred)

a first processor which performs a first processing in the plurality of processings for the image data received by said communication device; (Fig. 1, item 103 is a raster image data generator for rasterizing image data)

a second processor which performs a second processing in the plurality of processings, different from the first processing, for the image data received by said communication device; (Fig. 1, item 106, column 7, lines 18-27, the image data manager is used for converting an image format) and

It does not explicitly disclose "a controller which makes said first processor perform the first processing, makes said second processor perform the second processing and transmits the image data processed by said second processor through said communication device to an external apparatus which transmits the image data when the first and second processings are instructed by the command received by said communication device."

However, Tanaka discloses in Fig. 4 and in column 8, lines 30-38 discloses a CPU 303 that is used to control the functions of the printer. While the above limitation is not explicitly disclosed, one of ordinary skill would realize that the CPU would be the one to tell the other modules to perform their respective functions. In addition, column 10, lines 60-64 discloses that thumbnails can be displayed. Also in column 11, lines 19-35, Tanaka discloses that the data can be shown in HTML on the host, suggesting that the data would be transmitted from the printer to a host computer (i.e. an external source)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a CPU to control the various functions in a networked printer.

The motivation would have been to allow centralized control.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to alter to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claim 2, Tanaka discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said first processor performs printing of the image data. (Fig. 1, item 104. Although this is a different item than the raster image data generator 103, one of ordinary skill would realize that the different modules can be combined to perform the claimed functions)

Regarding claim 3, Tanaka discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said first processor transmits a file of portable document format of the image data. (column 7, lines 18-27, the conversion can be to a jpeg or pdf)

Regarding claim 4, Tanaka discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said second processor performs file conversion of the image data. (Fig. 1, item 106, column 7, lines 18-27, the image data manager is used for converting an image format)

Regarding claim 5, Tanaka discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 4, wherein an amount of image data is reduced by the file conversion. (Again,

the above mentions a conversion to a jpeg, which is known to be compressed data format)

Regarding claim 18, Tanaka discloses an image forming apparatus comprising:
a communication device which receives and transmits image data through a network; (Fig. 1, item 101 is a network interface. Fig. 2 shows data and various commands to be transferred)

a printer which prints image data received by said communication device on a recording medium; (Fig. 1, item 104, print engine)

a data processor which converts the image data received by said communication device to a predetermined file format; (Fig. 1, item 106, column 7, lines 18-27, the image data manager is used for converting an image format)

a controller which makes said printer to print the received image data and makes said communication device transmit the converted image data through the network to a predetermined destination. (Again, from claim 1 above, Fig. 4 and in column 8, lines 30-38 discloses a CPU 303 that is used to control the functions of the printer. The explanation of the obviousness would be the same as above)

II. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,048) in view of Tachibana (U.S. PG. Pub. No. 20010053246)

Regarding claim 6, the Tanaka reference discloses the usage of color conversion on image data, but does not disclose OCR.

Thus, it does not explicitly disclose "the image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said second processor performs color conversion or correction with use of optical character recognition for the image data."

However, Tachibana discloses in P[0066] that OCR is used in combination with color conversion.

Tanaka and Tachibana are combinable because both are in the art of converting data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used OCR along with the color conversion.

The motivation would have been to allow more efficient conversion of characters or text.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanaka and Tachibana to obtain the invention as specified.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yixing Qin whose telephone number is (571)272-7381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YQ

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625